



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/854,624      | 05/15/2001  | Yoko Kobayashi       | 1614.1166           | 8014             |

21171 7590 01/13/2004  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LEWIS, ADAM M

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2174

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/854,624

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI, YOKO

Examiner

Adam M. Lewis

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gavron et al. ("Gavron", *How to use Microsoft Windows NT4 Workstation*, ISBN# 1-56276-445-4).

As per claim 1, Gavron teaches a computer-readable recording medium recorded with a data item list display program for causing a computer to function as list display means for displaying a plurality of data items in different display forms in a list, the display forms corresponding to respective attributes of the data items (Gavron, Page 35, Section 2 and associated figure).

In the right portion of the window, the data items are displayed with an icon corresponding to the type of the data item.

Independent claims 10 and 15 are similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 8, Gavron teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as column header display means for displaying a column header corresponding to a display form of a selected one of the data items displayed in the list (Gavron, Page 35, Section 2 and

Art Unit: 2174

associated figure). In the figure, the right side of the screen shows a column header of Name, indicating that along with the data type depicted by the icon, the name is also listed.

Dependent claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, Gavron teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 8, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as column display width change means for changing a column display width of one of the data items which one corresponds to a displayed column header by changing a column display width of the displayed column header (Gavron, Page 35, figure in middle of page with callouts).

The figure in the middle of the page depicts columns that are adapted to the size of the information in each column.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gavron.

As per claims 2 and 3, which are dependent on claim 1, Gavron does not teach the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list

Art Unit: 2174

display means to include a table of correspondence between the attributes and the display forms, and to determine the display forms of the data items displayed in the list by referring to the table by the respective attributes of the data items.

However, OFFICIAL NOTICE is given that using a table of correspondence to determine attributes or display stored information about a data item, by means of the table storing the information directly or indirectly, is a widely accepted practice in the art, more commonly noted as a lookup table or LUT.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use a lookup table to determine the icon to display based on the data type because it provides an efficient and reliable way to effectively display such information.

5. Claims 4-7, 11-13, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gavron in view of Sullivan ("Sullivan", US# 5,737,557).

As per claim 4, Gavron does not teach the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display means to add icons of different sizes corresponding to the display forms to the data items in displaying the data items.

However, Sullivan teaches varying the dimensions of the icons being displayed (Sullivan, col. 6, lines 10-13). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the variable dimensioned icons of Sullivan in the data item list invention of Gavron because it would increase the visual appeal of icons representative of relatively more significant items, as well as to draw the user's attention to certain items (Sullivan, col. 6, lines 13-16).

Dependent claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Gavron further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 4, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as alignment and display means for aligning and displaying each of the data items of the different display forms (Microsoft, Figures 1-2, above).

Dependent claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Gavron further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 5, wherein the program causes said alignment and display means to function as area management means for managing an area in which data items are displayed and an area required to display the data items of the respective display forms (Microsoft, Figure 1, above).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Gavron further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 5, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as sorting and display means for sorting and displaying the data items of the respective display forms (Microsoft, Figures 1-2, above). The data items in Figures 1 and 2 above are sorted alphabetically by data item name.

Dependent claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Sullivan further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display

means to change types of fonts based on the display forms of the data items in displaying the data items (Sullivan, col. 6, lines 1-8).

Dependent claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 16, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cohen-Levy (US# 5,355,497) teaches a File directory structure generator and retrieval tool with document locator module mapping the directory structure of files to a real world hierarchical file structure.

Potter et al. (US# 5,497,484) teaches a file menu support for encapsulated applications.

Shin et al. (US# 5,557,787) teaches a table generating apparatus employing heading, layout, and table script data.

Liu et al. (US# 5,706,449) teaches a method and system for providing improved specification of multiple sort criteria in a graphical user interface.

Lawler et al. (US# 5,907,323) teaches an interactive program summary panel.

Meek (US# 5,933,145) teaches a method and system for visually indicating a selection query.

Fernandes (US# 6,014,135) teaches a collaboration centric document processing environment using an information centric visual user interface and information presentation method.

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M. Lewis whose telephone number is 703-305-0720. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-4:30, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

al

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100